



We national repudiation of the Declaration, which no one shall presume.

On this point, it is sufficient to state the plain historical facts of the case; to open the Declaration, and let it speak for itself; to note down its authoritative enunciations of self-evident truths; to receive, as the supreme law of the land, the very foundation of our State and National Government, the axiom, that "all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; that, "for the security of these rights, Governments are instituted among men." It is enough to know, that not one of our State Governments, nor the National Government, has pretended to repeal, or to set aside, this great principle. On the contrary, it is clear, that every returning Fourth of July witnesses the enthusiastic re-affirmation of these self-evident truths by the mass of the people, equivalent to a solemn ratification, over again, on their part, of the original Constitution of the United States, which first made them an independent nation, and organized them together as the people of the "United States." The Nation was born then; the "Union" was formed then; for it was the act of "Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled," that same Nation still lives: the same Union still continues; the same Declaration still stands. It was our Constitution at first; it is our Constitution still. The Constitution of 1789 annuls not one iota of either of it; it does not, in the main, change one iota of either of it; it secures the fulfillment of all the objects of organization, for protecting, not annihilating, its original design. It is impossible that such a Constitution should contain "compromises" with Slavery, "recognitions" of its legality, "guarantees" of its security.

To suppose this, would be to suppose that the Constitution of 1789, was designed to subvert and overthrow the Constitution of 1776, which we know was not the fact—for in that case, a despotism, and not a republican form of Government, would have been organized. To accuse the Federal Convention of such a design, is to accuse them of treason. To convict them of making "compromises" with Slavery, without any design, is to accuse them of treason, of knowing well, that the people would, if they could, accept such a Constitution, would be to suppose that they intended to subvert the liberties they had just achieved, which is incredible.

[REMAINDER OF LETTER XXIV NEXT WEEK.]

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1855.

### THE TWO WINGS OF THE ADMINISTRATION PARTY.

Evil associations corrupt good manners. The Richmond (*Va.*) *Examiner* must take care, or it may become demoralized by the party necessity that constrains it to excuse the action of its brethren of the Administration party in Ohio.

It will be recollect that the platform of that section is an omnibus, accommodating all sorts of passengers. In its January Convention it resolved, as usual, that Slavery is an "evil," and that it is duty to "use all power clearly given by the terms of the National Compact, to prevent its increase, and ultimately eradicate it; then, that each State is supreme over its domestic institutions; finally, in favor of the Baltimore platform.

The Whig press of the South of course funds nothing but Abolition in the first resolve. Why not? Does any Abolitionist go further? What is the doctrine of the party committed to political action against Slavery? That it is an evil, and that it is the duty of freemen to use all powers clearly given by the terms of the National Compact, to prevent its increase, to mitigate, and finally eradicate it. And it recognises with as much emphasis the supremacy of the State over its domestic institutions, and ultimately eradicates it; then, that each State is supreme over its domestic institutions; finally, in favor of the Baltimore platform.

Opposed as Senator Wilson and all the North have been, and now are to Slavery, we may at least refute our former opinions on the subject, that the Southern States have less to fear from him than from those Forney and Pierce Democrats who resolved, at Columbus, Ohio, finally to eradicate Slavery. We shall comment fully on this subject hereafter.

WASHINGTON, January 2, 1855.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to express, through you, to the Sachems of Tammany, my thanks for their invitation to join in the celebration of the fourth anniversary of the Birth of New Orleans. Tammany Hall would give me great pleasure to participate in fitting commemoration of a day so distinguished in American annals, and in all becoming demonstration of respect and honor for the hero and patriot whose renown is so inseparably associated with it. But my duties here will not permit me to accept the invitation with which I have been honored.

In "devotion to the Union of the States and their several rights, to the enforcement of all constitutional obligations, the honor of our flag and the preservation of Democratic principles from all corrupting influences," I am not willing to yield precedence to any man, though I certainly claim none for myself over the Democratic party of all others. The Convention of all sensible Democrats should be to make this sentiment practically efficient in the accomplishment of the ends to which it naturally directs itself.

To preserve the Union unimpaired, and to make it, not merely a constitutional bond, but a living sentiment, the Government which represents it must carefully refrain from every oppressive exercise of power, whether operating on States or individuals.

To secure the fulfilment of constitutional obligations, it is needful that the Constitution should be expounded in the spirit of equity, justice, and humanity—in one word, of Democracy—no doubtful powers being asserted, and all needless harshness in the exercise of clear powers!

With what satisfaction the South shakes hands with the North! How completely Pro-Slavery embraces Anti-Slavery! "If Senator Wilson's emphatic response to our inquiries," says Mr. Ellis, "does not check the progress of the enemies of the American Party, in their mischievous attempts to identify our Party with Abolitionism, we underate the intelligence of the People of the South!"

The reader at once asks, how can Light and Darkness dwell together? How can opposites stand side by side? How can the Anti-Slavery agitator and the Pro-Slavery quietest affiliate with each other? How can a Senator who believes Slavery the paramount question, and an editor who holds that it is, and shall be, no Question at all, occupy the same political platform, "work beside each other in the same political Party?" How is it that a conspicuous Anti-Slavery agitator, a "higher law" politician, an active member of a class at the North, denounced by Vespasian Ellis as "Abolition fanatics," has replied to certain inquiries of said Ellis respecting Slavery, Abolition, and the higher law, in such a manner as to secure the endorsement of that gentleman? Has Mr. Wilson ignored his peculiar opinions, modified them, clothed them in ambiguous language, failed to state the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth? Has Mr. Ellis changed his opinions, or renounced them? Is he deceived, or is he willing that the South should be deceived?

We must examine the correspondence itself, and in the light of the circumstances that called it forth.

Mr. Wilson has long been understood to occupy a prominent position among those designated distinctively as Free-Soilers. He bolted the nomination of General Taylor, because he was non-committal on the Slavery Question; he voted for Martin Van Buren, because he presided over the Convention at Pittsburgh that nominated John P. Hale; he was known subsequently as a thorough, uncompromising advocate of distinct political action against Slavery, in the ranks of the Independent or Free Democratic Party. His election to the Senate of the United States, by a Know Nothing Legislature, naturally awakened deep concern in that large portion of the Know Nothing Order, which ignores the Slavery Question, aspires after what is called, by pro-slavery men, "Nationality," and is now hoping to carry the elections in the slave states. Especially was the shock felt in Virginia, where the Administration press holding up the fact, as damning proof that Know Nothingism at the North is, after all, Abolitionism in disguise.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17, 1855.

DEAR SIR: Referring you to my editorials for the last two weeks, I have to ask you how far I have correctly represented your views in my comments upon your letter of 20th January, and the articles in the Boston *Bee*, which I have copied? In other words, do you not recognise the doctrine of State Rights, so far as the general States are to regulate the question of Slavery in their own mode within their State limits? Do you not entertain the opinion that Congress has power to interfere with the State Rights? Do you not recognise that "higher law" doctrine, which permits you as a Senator to disregard the binding obligations of the Constitution? Does the "American organization" in Massachusetts embrace the regulation of the National compact to prevent its increase, &c., they at the same time recognise the doctrine that "to each State belongs the right to adopt such internal laws as it may see fit to regulate its own internal affairs, to hold and maintain an equal and independent sovereignty with each and every State, and that upon these rights the National Legislature can neither legislate or encroach?" Is not the denunciation of Slavery really emancipated as those for the regulation of which organization was formed?

And yet, see with what charity this press explains and excuses a declaration, which, if made by Free-Soilers, it would deem incendiary and horrid:

"It will be seen that, while the resolutions on Slavery are far from being satisfactory to us, they are not as malignant and mischievous, as the Whig press, relying on telegraphic reports, had represented them. While regarding Slavery as an 'evil' and avowing it to be 'their duty to use all power clearly given by the terms of the national compact to prevent its increase,' &c., they at the same time recognise the doctrine that 'to each State belongs the right to adopt such internal laws as it may see fit to regulate its own internal affairs, to hold and maintain an equal and independent sovereignty with each and every State, and that upon these rights the National Legislature can neither legislate or encroach.'

Sen. Wilson, My answer to your inquiries will oblige your obedient servant,

VESPASIAN ELLIS,  
Editor *American Organ.*

Hon. Henry Wilson, U. S. Senate.

SENATE CHAMBER, Feb. 19, 1855.

DEAR SIR: My answer to your inquiries will be brief and explicit.

1st. I fully recognise the doctrine of *State Rights*, in its application to Slavery, as well as to any other measure of public concern.

The Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798, in the main, as I think, correctly set forth that doctrine.

The whole subject of Slavery within State limits should be left absolutely to State legislation.

2d. My response to your second question is included in my answer to your first. Do not entertain the opinion that Congress has any power to interfere with Slavery as it exists at present.

3d. Every man who believes in a God must believe that there is a law paramount to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United States, which requires me, as a Senator from Massachusetts, to do anything in opposition to all human law, and that law is to be obeyed by men in public and private life, rather than any human law in conflict with it. But I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States, as I understand the Constitution of the United

was going to say. (To the Free-Soilers)—Now own up, gentlemen; you knew all about this bill, and what each other were going to say on it. I do not say it in my Senatorial capacity, but personally, I verily believe you are a band of traitors.

Mr. Chase moved the Senate adjourn. Lost—nay 30, yeas 7.

Mr. Pratt ridiculed the idea of State sovereignty, and gave a dissertation on the Romans, Scandinavians, Normans, Saxons, Goths, Vandals, the Gracchi, &c.

Mr. Wilson was ready to carry out every provision of the Constitution, but was opposed to the existence of Slavery in the District of Columbia or in the Territories of the United States, and he and those who acted with him were determined to abolish it there. They believed they shared the responsibility of its existence wherever it was under the control of Congress, and they desired to relieve themselves of that responsibility. He earnestly desired the permanence of the Union, and that if the Fugitive Slave Law should be repealed, the provisions of the Constitution would be carried out by the States themselves.

Mr. Weld said, if Mr. Wilson was disposed to carry out the provisions of the Constitution, he would go hand in hand with him. He had heard him charged with being a disunionist. He was glad that such was not the case.

[Mr. Seward followed. His speech will be given in full next week.]

Mr. Bayard. Some States have recently, by their legislation, endeavored to render the laws of the United States nugatory; hence the necessity of such a bill as this. One State imprisons as a felon him who asserts his right to property, and inflicts upon him his punishment. Another State legislates to prohibit the importation of slaves, or otherwise can fulfill his duty in reference to the laws of the United States. If these States can carry their points against the United States there must be a dissolution. They have already done something toward this, through mobs and murder—now they are attempting further to resist the laws of Congress by legislation.

Mr. Sumner. It is now near midnight. Since 11 o'clock this morning, we have been in our seats. This is the day usually set apart for private claims. There are seventy-five private bills unclaimed—sacrificed to Slavery, in one of its most odious forms. There is a seeming apology for Slavery at home, but that apology fails with him who has the intelligence and skill to see its freedom.

Mr. Ruskin. Point out a word in that bill which speaks of Slavery.

Mr. Sumner read the caption of the bill. It has been ably discussed by my friend from Ohio and others. By the admission of this whole debate, it is a bill to bolster up the Fugitive Slave Act.

Mr. Ruskin. If the officers of the United States are not to be protected, repeat your law.

Mr. Sumner. So say I. "Repeal your law." There is neither the word "Slave" nor "Slavey" in the Constitution. The bill reported by a Senator from the North, to bind anew the chains of the slave. Some Senators regard the Fugitive Slave Law as unconstitutional, others conceding, believe it to be so.

There is another clause, side by side with the "held to labor" clause, guaranteeing the same privileges and immunities in all the States, and to the citizens of each State Citizens from the free States, in more than one State, have been put in prison, and in some instances sold.

Mr. Butler. Do you embrace South Carolina in your statement?

Mr. Sumner. I do. South Carolina has, by her Legislature, claimed the right to interpret that clause, and Congress has no power to legislate under that clause. I say of Massachusetts, that no person is held to labor, claim that she has no similar right to interpret and discuss the right of Congress to legislate upon this clause.

This Fugitive Slave Act is unconstitutional. You from the South brought Slavery into Congress when you passed the law in reference to Slavey, which the North did not.

Mr. Gwin. Presented the petition of C. Ludwig Richter, for an appropriation to him, to erect a bronze monument to commemorate Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Seward presented the petition of C. Ludwig Richter, for an appropriation to him, to erect a bronze monument to commemorate Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being a supplement to acts to secure and settle private land claims in California.

The civil and diplomatic appropriation bill came from the House, embodying a tariff bill, which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Seward introduced a bill amending the judicial system, so that a subsequent term of a Federal court can complete unfinished business of the preceding term, without a *de novo* examination of the case. Passed.

A resolution was offered, requiring the Committee on Commerce to inquire into the expediency of increasing the salaries of steamboat inspectors at Wheeling and Nashville; and another, directing the Secretary of the Navy to make a certain number of copies of reports of surveys of the railroads to the Pacific; for the survey railroad route from Puget Sound, by Fort Hall and Great Salt Lake, to the Mississippi river; and the report of John C. Fremont, of a railroad route from the head-waters of the Arkansas river, into the State of California, together with the maps and plats accompanying the respective papers.

Mr. Gwin presented a petition for a revival of the act of February 23d, 1854, being

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the National Era.

## THE FROST KING.

By ANN SUMNER DRAKE.

The Winter months have come again; The days are short, the nights are long; The last November day has passed, And still December has come at last.

I watched the sun go down, his eyes, And he lingered long as I beth to leave; The quiet earth and cloudless sky; He lingered long, for a few was night.

He lingered long, but went at last; And soon there came a Northern blast, With frosty shrill, and rushing wing; And biting bents, the frost King.

His sceptre touched a passing cloud, And there fell to earth a snowy shower; It lay on the fields and the garden bower, And hid with its folds the autumnal bough.

He passed through the paths of the forest bare, And hung out the folds of his banner there; He passed where the sparkling wafts gleam, And checked the dew of the playful stream.

And the tyrant layed along in glee,

For none from his chilling power could flee;

The spray on the rock, the flowers in the field,

Were all by his breath congealed.

He left the forest and frozen plain, And sprang to his cloudy car again; He took his way to the crowded town, But the walls of his brick decked his bower.

He knocked at the door, but knocked in vain; He went to the window, and wrote on the pane; Then, turning away from the rich man's door, He sought the home of the humble poor.

The home of the poor, 'twas an open shanty, And the tyrant came with haughty wade;

Fate opposed his entrance there,

To that dark shade of want and care.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;

A pallet of straw was their only bed,

As they lay asleep in that lowly shanty.

He found a mother and babe within; Their cheeks were pale, and their garments thin;